

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Master File No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC

MDL No. 1917

Individual Case No. 11-cv-06205 SC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS  
THE STATE OF FLORIDA'S  
COMPLAINT**

Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti

Special Master: Hon. Charles A. Legge (Ret.)

MASTER FILE NO. 3:07-CV-05944-SC

MDL NO. 1917

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS THE FLORIDA COMPLAINT**

1 The Motion to Dismiss the State of Florida's Complaint ("Complaint"), filed by  
 2 Defendants Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd. (n/k/a Japan Display East, Inc.), Hitachi Asia,  
 3 Ltd., Hitachi America, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc., Koninklijke Philips  
 4 Electronics N.V., Philips Electronics North America Corporation, Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a  
 5 Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), Panasonic Corporation of North America, MT Picture  
 6 Display Co., Ltd., LG Electronics, Inc., LG, LG Electronics USA, Inc., Samsung SDI America,  
 7 Inc., Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Samsung SDI (Malaysia) SDN, BHD., Samsung SDI Mexico S.A.  
 8 DE C.V., Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda., Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Tianjin Samsung SDI Co.,  
 9 Ltd., Toshiba Corporation, and Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc. (hereinafter,  
 10 "Defendants") came on for hearing before this Court.

11 Having considered all papers filed in support of an in opposition to said motion, and  
 12 having entertained argument of counsel, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED  
 13 that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED.

- 14 1. Florida's second claim for relief under the Florida Antitrust Act ("FAA") and Florida's  
 15 third claim for relief under the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act  
 16 ("FDUTPA") are DISMISSED because they are barred by the applicable statute of  
 17 limitations.
- 18 2. Florida's second claim for relief under the FAA is DISMISSED because it is based on  
 19 out-of-state purchases.
- 20 3. Florida's first claim for relief under the Sherman Act and its second claim for relief under  
 21 the FAA are DISMISSED to the extent they seek to recover for indirect purchases of CRT  
 22 finished products.

23  
 24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25  
 26 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Hon. Charles A. Legge  
 United States District Judge (Ret.)  
 Special Master

28 MASTER FILE NO. 3:07-CV-05944-SC

MDL NO. 1917

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS THE FLORIDA COMPLAINT

DB2/ 23322584.1

1 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

2 Hon. Samuel Conti  
3 United States District Judge

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MASTER FILE NO. 3:07-CV-05944-SC

MDL NO. 1917

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS THE FLORIDA COMPLAINT

DB2/ 23322584.1